

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 239

FL 017 167

AUTHOR Andresen, Julie Tetel
TITLE Whitney and Bloomfield on American English.
PUB DATE Dec 87
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America (San Francisco, CA, December 27-30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Indian Languages; Authors; Comparative Analysis; *Descriptive Linguistics; *Diachronic Linguistics; Dialects; Language Research; Language Role; Language Variation; *Linguistic Theory; *North American English; *Research Methodology; Sociolinguistics; Structural Linguistics
IDENTIFIERS *Bloomfield (Leonard); Language Contact; *Whitney (William Dwight)

ABSTRACT

An examination of the place of American English in the research of William Dwight Whitney and Leonard Bloomfield focuses on the divergence of their approaches to language. A review of their works looks at the way in which Whitney's interest in American English complemented his other strong interests (the social and political setting for language and language change, languages in contact, and dialect variation) and the manner in which Bloomfield's corresponding lack of interest in American English led him away from these approaches and to more internal psychological and structural explanations for language and language change. The influence of works by Wilhelm Wundt and Franz Boas on early Bloomfield and their role in his shift away from the concerns of American English are discussed. (MSE)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED291239

WHITNEY AND BLOOMFIELD ON AMERICAN ENGLISH

Julie Tetel Andreson

Paper presented at the LSA/AAAL/ADS Annual Meeting (27-30
December 1987) San Francisco, CA.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. T. Andreson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL017167

History of Linguistics Bloomfield

Whitney and Bloomfield on American English

In the preface to his Introduction to the Study of Language (1914), Leonard Bloomfield states his desire to follow in the path opened up by William Dwight Whitney in Language and the Study of Language (1867) and The Life and Growth of Language (1875). Despite Bloomfield's acknowledged debt to Whitney, little attention has been given to Bloomfield's direct relationship to Whitney. That relationship, then, is the general topic of my paper. My specific topic will focus on the contrasting places that the study of American English occupies in their respective works and on the consequences of those differences for their two approaches to language.

Although in his 1914 Introduction Bloomfield consciously continued Whitney's lead in forging a path for the autonomous study of language, Bloomfield broke with Whitney's concern for the study of American English. Whitney's concern belongs to a major 19th-century American tradition -- dating back to Noah Webster, at least -- which emphasizes a social and political awareness of American English, set against the British Standard. Just as Webster called for a declaration of independence from the language of George III, Whitney is given to making such statements as "Aristocracy and exclusiveness tend to final overthrow, in language as in politics". Whitney writes of language as an institution, a res publica, wherein "the speakers of a language constitute a republic, or rather, a democracy". He refers to the linguistic act as one of "general suffrage" and "ratification". Both Webster and Whitney, furthermore, subscribe to a kind of Manifest Destiny for the English language in America.

By 1914 and Bloomfield's Introduction, this expansionist feeling for American English is completely gone. Gone, too, in Bloomfield is a feeling for the social and political setting for language that played so fundamental a role in the American experience with language up until the 20th century. Although Bloomfield is certainly aware of the social character of language, he speaks of it in his first book exclusively in terms of mechanized and unconscious habits.

I will want to show, then, how Whitney's interest in American English went hand-in-hand with his other strong interests: in the social and political setting for language and language change, in languages-in-contact, in dialect variation; and how Bloomfield's corresponding lack of interest in American English led him away from these approaches and to more internal psychological and structural explanations for language and language change. An understanding of the reasons behind Bloomfield's shift away from the concerns of American English will not be complete without taking into account the influence on the early Bloomfield of both Wilhelm Wundt's Völkerpsychologie and of Franz Boas's Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages (1911).

Whitney and Bloomfield on American English

My purpose this afternoon is to sketch the state of American linguistic activity around the turn of the 20th century. I base this sketch primarily on Leonard Bloomfield's first book, An Introduction to the Study of Language, published in 1914. In the Preface to this work, Bloomfield (1887-1949) states his desire to follow in the path opened up by fellow American William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894) in Language and the Study of Language (1867) and The Life and Growth of Language (1875). Bloomfield, like Whitney, was interested both in studying language as an autonomous entity and in carving out a place for its study in the academic institution. However, despite Bloomfield's acknowledged debt to Whitney, little attention has been given to Bloomfield's direct relationship to Whitney's work.(1) That relationship, then, is my focus today. I will attempt to describe where Whitney and Bloomfield diverge in their approaches to the study of language, and where they coincide.

This attempt I will place first within the larger context of American linguistics as a whole.

The American Foreground

As part of a larger study now in progress, I am claiming that three discernable arcs of development capture a significant portion of American linguistic activity from the

late 18th century through the mid-1920s: 1) the study and classification of the native American Indian languages; 2) the défense et illustration of American English set against the British standard; and 3) the rise of the autonomous study of language which Whitney and Bloomfield did so much to shape in the United States. This third arc, of course, parallels similar developments in French and German thinking in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

These three arcs of development are historiographic constructs, only identifiable in retrospect. The early 19th-century American linguist John Pickering (1777-1846), for instance, recognized no such distinctions and wrote widely across the subject boundaries in all three areas.(2) However, a century later, that is, by 1924 and the creation of the Linguistic Society of America, the study of language in the United States had become specialized enough to have warranted a de facto separation of these three areas of interest, as evidenced by the existence of three separate journals: the 1) International Journal of American Linguistics (est. 1917) whose first editor was Franz Boas (1858-1942); 2) American Speech (est. 1926) whose first editor was Louise Pound (1872-1958), along with Kemp Malone (1889-1971) and Arthur Kennedy (1880-1954); and 3) Language (est. 1925) whose first editor was George Bolling (1871-1963) but whose organizing force was, of course, Bloomfield. American linguistics up until 1924 can be summed up in the list of the 264 founding members of the LSA: a little less than one third

of the members were affiliated with anthropology, about one third were professors of English and the rest came from such disciplines as Greek, Latin, and either Germanic or Indo-European philology.

The German Background

Perhaps the least obvious link among these three arcs of development -- but certainly the most interesting one from the point of view of this conference in Germany -- was the (so to speak) German Connection. German thought pervaded and profoundly influenced all areas of American language study during the 19th century, indeed, the social sciences in general and even, more broadly speaking, the entire American educational system itself. The first American to establish intellectual ties to Germany was Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) who visited Gottingen in 1766. Following in Franklin's footsteps went such influential statesmen and educators as Edward Everett (1794-1865) and George Bancroft (1800-1891) who returned from their Grand Tours no longer awed by British English but fully awed by German science. Everett impressed upon his student, Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) -- that quintessential American -- a love for German science. In 1820 Bancroft put W. von Humboldt (1767-1835) in contact with the work of John Pickering, mentioned above, in particular with Pickering's American Indian language studies. Humboldt was impressed both with Pickering's desire "to study human language as a science" and Pickering's use of data from

American Indian languages to establish that science.

Humboldt and Pickering maintained a lively correspondence until Humboldt's death. Pickering corresponded as well with J. C. Adelung (1732-1806) and J. S. Vater (1771-1826). (3)

The influence of German thought at the turn of the American 20th century can hardly be overestimated. Between the years 1820 and 1920 nearly nine thousand Americans studied in the lecture halls and laboratories of German universities (Herbst:1). William Dwight Whitney made his pilgrimage to Germany in 1850 to study with Franz Bopp (1791-1867), Albrecht Weber (1825-1901) and Karl Lepsius (1810-1884) in Berlin and with Rudolf von Roth (1821-1895) in Tübingen. Whitney received his Ph.D. from the University of Breslau in 1861. Bloomfield followed suit in 1913-14 to study at Leipzig and Göttingen with August Leskien (1840-1916, the translator of Whitney's The Life and Growth of Language), Karl Brugmann (1849-1919) and Hermann Oldenberg (1854-1920). Bloomfield was, in fact, employed as a German teacher for most of his academic career. Louise Pound, mentioned above as the first editor of American Speech, took her Ph.D. at the University of Heidelberg in 1900. Franz Boas and Edward Sapir (1884-1939), the guiding lights of American Indian languages studies in the early decades of the 20th century were, of course, German by birth. Sapir was deeply influenced by German Romanticism and wrote his Master's Essay on Herder's Über den Ursprung der Sprache (1907).

The Second Arc of Development : The Consciousness of American English

However, although Whitney acknowledged the preeminence of the German science of his day (1875:317-19), taught German privately to supplement his salary at Yale and even wrote two German readers (1870, 1876), two German grammars (1869, 1885) and a German dictionary (1887), Whitney maintained a strong English-language orientation in his work. It is precisely Bloomfield's German-language orientation in the Introduction of 1914 that marks the major rupture with Whitney's approach. Now, I am not referring here to the several long pedagogical passages on points of German grammar that appear in Bloomfield 1914 (143, 147, 180), nor even the entire chapter he devotes to the teaching of spoken foreign languages (Chapter IX), which have no real counterpart in Whitney's two Languages. Rather, what is absent in Bloomfield but present in Whitney is a social and political consciousness of language that results from an awareness of the specifically American variety of English set against the British Standard. This consciousness played a fundamental role in the American experience with language in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Bloomfield's rupture with the American English-language tradition alters his approach to language in several ways:

1. Whitney -- but certainly not Bloomfield -- subscribes to the sort of linguistic Manifest Destiny for the English language which was announced by Noah Webster (1758-1843) almost a century before. In his Dissertations of 1789,

Webster predicted that "within a century and a half, North America will be peopled with a hundred millions of men, all speaking the same language" (1951 [1789]:21). Webster heartily welcomed this prospect and invested his prediction with social and political implications. He argued that, on the very basis of future numerical superiority, Americans should declare independence from the language of George III just as they had earlier declared their political independence. Echos of Webster can be heard in Whitney's prediction about the future of English, which he, too, couches in a social and political context:

The English is already, perhaps, spoken and written as mother-tongue by a greater number of persons than any other existing dialect of high cultivation; and its sphere seems to be widening, at home and abroad, more rapidly than any other. If it ever becomes a world-language, it will do so, of course, not on account of its superiority as a form of human speech--since no one ever yet abandoned his own vernacular and adopted another because the latter was a better language--but by the effect of social and political conditions, which shall widen the boundaries of the English-speaking community. Yet we cannot but be desirous to convince ourselves that it is worthy of so high a destiny. (1867:470).

On the subject of Americans freeing themselves from the yoke of British linguistic domination, Whitney writes: "Our [American] increasing numbers and our growing independence of character and culture will give us in our own estimation an equal right [to determine our own speaking norms]...and we shall feel more and more unwilling to yield implicitly to British precedent" (1867:173). Whitney was involved enough with English to write Essentials of English Grammar in 1877 and to have helped establish the Spelling Reform Association (1876) and the American Dialect Society (1889).

In his Introduction, Bloomfield does address some of the issues that form the American English-language tradition, but he does so without the social and political implications. On the subject of the English language in America, Bloomfield states (perhaps unconsciously) the fulfillment of Webster's essentially correct prophesy in matter-of-fact terms: "Our continent, north of Mexico, once harbored a few million Indians speaking over a hundred, perhaps several hundreds, of mutually unintelligible languages; today this area contains more than a hundred million inhabitants, nearly all of whom speak English" (1914:262). This passage appears in the sections on the "Increase in uniformity" and "Decrease in uniformity" in language and does not portray this circumstance as desirable or undesirable. Bloomfield ends the passage by mentioning that the differentiation among the global varieties of English will probably never rise to the point of unintelligibility (1914:265). This observation echoes Whitney's

similar observation that there has been little loss of intelligibility between British English and American English (1867:172-3) which responds, in turn, to Webster's incorrect prediction that the two Englishes would diverge to produce "in the course of time, a language in North America, as different from the future language of England, as the modern Dutch, Danish and Swedish are from the German, or from one another" (1951 [1789]:22-23).

Let us remember that Bloomfield had reason to be far less interested in American English than in those languages which American English had displaced, i.e. the American Indian languages. Bloomfield was well acquainted with yet another Introduction written in the early decades of the 20th century, this one to the Handbook of American Indian Languages by Franz Boas (1911). Boas led American anthropology out of the 19th century with its barbarism-savagery-civilization hierarchy and into the relativist 20th century. Bloomfield, under Boas's influence, focused away from the concerns of American English with its social and political implications and was able, in effect, to "correct" Whitney's 19th-century bias. When discussing the very subjects of the increase and decrease of diversity in language, Whitney opines:

As, here in America, a single cultivated nation, of homogeneous speech, is taking the place of a congeries of wild tribes, with their host of discordant tongues, so, on a smaller scale, is it everywhere else:

civilization and the conditions it makes
are gaining upon barbarism and its isolat-
ing influences. (1867:181)

Bloomfield, along with Boas, was helping to alter the linguistic optic that saw "congeries of wild tribes, with their host of discordant tongues." Boas's and Bloomfield's new perspectives on language resulted from closer investigations of the American Indian languages, with less importance given to the study of English.

But was it only that the revaluation of the American Indian languages needed to be "paid for" at the expense of American English studies? Or were there others reasons why Bloomfield should have ignored the issue of American English that had so fired Whitney's interest? There are several possibilities. Perhaps it was that, by 1914, the expansionist movement in America had, for the most part, run its course, and so the issue of the spread of English in the world was no longer interesting. Or, perhaps, Americans had more or less overcome their inferiority complex vis-à-vis the British and did not need to defend themselves. It might also be that the prestige of German science was by then so great that the concern for mere English had become an occupation for lesser minds. Or it could be -- and this I believe strongly to be the case -- that the lack of interest in American English indexed for linguists such as Boas, Sapir and Bloomfield a reaction against the thoroughly anglo-saxon lock on American academic life that certainly existed at the turn of the 20th

century and still exists in many institutions today. (4) Whitney was, in fact, a prime example of the 19th-century anglo-saxon academic mandarin in the United States.

The positive consequence of revaluing the American Indians languages has had a negative consequence as well, namely that a place for American English studies has been denied within the framework of general linguistics in the United States. Bloomfield's focus away from American English consciousness eclipsed, in effect, the history of this major arc of development in American linguistic thought. Today, for instance, Whitney's work on English is disregarded. Noah Webster is considered something of a marginal figure, at best, in the linguistic history of the United States. John Pickering is all but unknown.

2. A second, rather negative consequence of Bloomfield's lack of interest in the theoretical implications of the home-grown study of American English is that the major part of the social and political framework of Whitney's approach to language is lost. Bloomfield's purpose, as he states it in the Preface to his Introduction, was to incorporate the progress made in the science of language since Whitney's time. This progress was made, in Bloomfield's opinion, primarily by Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) and his Völkerpsychologie. It is indeed the Wundtian orientation of Bloomfield's Introduction that has attracted attention from scholars: Chapter III "The Mental Basis of Language", the passage on word order (186-88), and the passage on the rela-

tionship of linguistics to psychology (322-23). This Wundtian orientation is then usually contrasted to Bloomfield's later, radical change to the behaviorist psychology of his colleague at Ohio State, A. P. Weiss (1879-1931).

By wiping the slate clean of Whitney's American English consciousness, Bloomfield also wiped out such politically charged statements of the type found in Whitney: "Aristocracy and exclusiveness tend to final overthrow, in language as in politics" (1867:150). Whitney, from his vantage point in 19th-century America -- as opposed to 19th-century Europe -- was imbued with the idea of language as res publica, that is, as an institution, a democratic institution. "The speakers of a language thus constitute a republic," Whitney writes, "or rather, a democracy, in which authority is conferred only by general suffrage and for due cause, and is exercised under constant supervision and control" (1867:38). In several passages, he compares the linguistic act to voting (suffrage) or ratification: "The community ratified his act [of naming]" (1867:38; also 1867:173). Or, again, more forcefully, Whitney writes:

The whole process of language-making and language-changing, in all its different departments, is composed of single acts, performed by individuals; yet each act is determined, not alone by the needs of the particular case, but also by the general usages of the community as acting in and

represented by the individual; so that, in its initiation as well as its acceptance and ratification, it is virtually the act of the community, as truly conventional as if men held a meeting for its discussion and decision. (1867:148)

Bloomfield's approach is very different. He is, of course, aware of the social character of language, but he thoroughly downplays this character. He devotes only one separate paragraph to it (17) in his first chapter and writes of it in this passage and throughout the book exclusively in terms of habit. (5)

Whitney's interest in American English went hand-in-hand with his interest in the social and political setting for language and language change, in languages-in-contact, and in dialect variation. Bloomfield's lack of interest in American English led him away from these approaches and to more internal psychological and structural explanations for language and language change. (6)

3. Yet another consequence of Bloomfield's break with the American English tradition was the accompanying break with Whitney's sign theory. Sign theory belongs more to Anglo-French thought of the 18th century which Whitney inherited than to 19th-century German thought which Bloomfield was transmitting. Space does not permit an elaboration of this fourth point. I note merely that Whitney is apt to formulate language as "the most perfect system of signs" (1867:111) and

as "a system of arbitrary signs for thought" (1867:410). In contrast, Bloomfield formulates that:

...language is not...a system of unalterably fixed and indivisible elements. It is rather a complex set of associations and experiences in groups, each of which is accompanied by a habitual sound-utterance, -- and all these associations are, like all others, certain of displacement in the course of time. (1914:70)

An examination of Whitney's and Bloomfield's uses of the term 'system' also goes beyond the bounds of this paper. (7)

The Data Base

Where ruptures exist between Whitney's and Bloomfield's attitudes toward the importance of American English, continuities between their two approaches to language emerge out of a comparison of their two data bases. A surprising continuity exists, in fact, in their use of data from American Indian languages, which brings us, once again, to the first arc of development and Franz Boas. As stated above, Bloomfield knew Boas's Introduction well, so well, in fact, that Boas's now-famous passage on the significance of morphologic phenomena is closely paraphrased in Bloomfield. (8) Bloomfield also repeats Boas's strong arguments against the association of race-language-culture (1911:5-14; 1914:271) and devotes a section on the relationship between linguistics and ethnology

(1914:321-22).

However, the data Bloomfield chooses from American Indian languages to illustrate various points do not come from Boas, as one might expect, but from straight out of Whitney. It is often said that Whitney's great advance in linguistic science was to have oriented the study of language toward real linguistic data rather than abstract speculation. Bloomfield's Introduction follows this orientation and, in fact, makes ample use of Whitney's own examples. Whereas I was not surprised to discover the extent to which Bloomfield "recycled" Whitney's data from the Indo-European languages (e.g. the etymology of mint 1914:247-8 from 1867:247-8 -- to name but one!), I was very surprised to discover that Bloomfield used as well Whitney's examples from the aboriginal American languages, for instance, Whitney's example of the "Mexican" grammatical feature of incorporation (Einverleibung) in the phrase "I-flesh-eat" (1867:349) which Bloomfield refers to four times throughout his book (98, 167, 179 and 253). The tradition of using data from American Indian languages in the interests of the scientific study of language dates back to John Pickering (see note 3). Bloomfield's own studies of Amerind (Algonquian) began after his Introduction, that is, in the 1920s.

Summary

Bloomfield consciously followed Whitney's lead of trying to study language as an autonomous entity and of forging a

path for its scientific study. This effort I have identified as the third arc of development in the history of American linguistics. However, Bloomfield broke with the tradition dating back to Noah Webster and taken up by Whitney concerning the social and political implications of American English: the desirability of its spread across the North American continent and the rejection of the British Standard. This tradition I have identified as the second arc of development. At the same time, Bloomfield preserved Whitney's data base, even that from the American Indian languages, the study of which forms the first arc of development. Thus, Whitney and Bloomfield -- those two individuals most associated with the rise of an autonomous study of language in the United States -- depend on a tradition utilizing American Indian language data that reaches back, at least, to John Pickering. The three arcs of development have never been separate in American linguistic history; they have always been fundamentally intertwined.

I am aware that this sketch of the state of American linguistic activity around the turn of the 20th century has not taken a full account Boas's influence on the early Bloomfield. The triangular relationship between Whitney-Boas-Bloomfield is a part of my larger study in progress.

Julie Tetel Andresen / Department of English /
Duke University / Durham, N.C. / 27706 / USA

Notes

- (1) I have long been intrigued by a statement made by Charles Hockett. He has observed that:

...I found Bloomfield's synthesis satisfying (except in some minor technical details) that for a long time I simply couldn't bring myself to read much of the work of [Bloomfield's] predecessors. That was the price I paid for my largely superb induction into our discipline. Then, just a few months ago, I finally had reason to undertake a serious study of William Dwight Whitney's general writings. I knew that Bloomfield had overtly acknowledged his debt to Whitney; nevertheless, I was overwhelmed to discover the extent of that debt (and thus our own), and amazed at the variety of topics on which Whitney's remarks, allowing for a difference of terminology and style, are as valid and profound now as a century ago. (1980: 106)

Now, even Charles Hockett, who is the editor of The Leonard Bloomfield Anthology, had not fully realized the extent of Bloomfield's relationship to Whitney's work until recently -- clear evidence of the general neglect of Whitney on the American scene.

In contrast, however, Konrad Koerner devoted an entire chapter to Whitney's influence on Saussure in his Ferdinand de Saussure (1973). Nothing comparable to Koerner's study yet exists for Whitney's influence on Bloomfield.

- (2) A scan of John Pickering's extensive bibliography indicates the scope of his interests: A Vocabulary or Collection of Words and Phrases which have been supposed to be peculiar to the United States of America (1816); On the Pronunciation of the Greek Language (1818); On the Adoption of a Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages of North America (1820); numerous reviews in newspapers and journals of Indian grammars, as well as the Encyclopedia Americana entry "Indian languages of America" (Vol. IV).

- (3) Kurt Müller-Vollmer claims, dass Pickerings Aufsatz in den Verhandlungen der historisch-philologischen Klasse des Jahres 1819 der Amerikanischen Philosophischen Gesellschaft "mit Fug und Recht als der Beginn der amerikanischen Linguistik gelten kann" (1974:260). It was this article that Humboldt had been given by Bancroft and that prompted him to begin a correspondence with Pickering. As Müller-Vollmer explains:

Was Humboldt hier, auf wenige Seiten konzentriert, zu lesen bekam, erregte sogleich seine

Aufmerksamkeit. Es entsprach ziemlich genau seinen eigenen Vorstellungen von der Sprache als einem Schlüssel zum Verständnis der Geschichte und der geistigen Erzeugnisse der Menschheit, entsprach vor allem seiner Überzeugung, die Sprachwissenschaft müsse sich, um dem Phänomen der Sprache gerecht zu werden, sowohl der philosophischen Grammatik (der Theoriebildung) und der empirischen Einzel- forschung bedienen. Denn, so formulierte Pickering in dem besagten Aufsatz, wollen wir die menschliche Rede zum Gegenstand einer Wissenschaft machen (to study human speech as a science), so ist es unabdingbar für den auf die grösseren Zusammenhänge bedachten Philologen, wenn ihm die philosophische Grammatik überhaupt zu etwas nützen solle, sich so vieler sprachlicher Erscheinungen und Tatsachen zu vergewissern als nur möglich. Und dazu sind nun die schriftlosen Sprachen der Naturvölker Amerikas ein ausgezeichnetes Objekt. (1974:260)

Pickering incorporated data from American Indian languages into his general theory of language and, thus, began an American tradition that is carried out in both Whitney and Bloomfield.

- (4) Boas, for one, disassociated himself from American linguistics by disclaiming his identity as an American linguist. Boas's attitude is recounted by Roman Jakobson, in speaking of his own first days in the United States:

I recall [Boas's] amiable, congenial house in Grantwood, New Jersey, where the host, with his keen sense of humor, used to say to his sister in my presence: 'Jakobson ist ein seltsamer Mann!' He thinks that I am an American linguist!' (1979:164)

It is extremely difficult to say whether Boas felt the effects of an anti-semitic American intellectual community. For Sapir, more information is available. It has been said that Sapir "encountered a certain amount of anti-semitic feeling (for example, he was apparently blackballed from the Yale faculty club)" (p. 219, Stephen Anderson, Phonology in the Twentieth Century, 1985, U. of Chicago Press).

- (5) Bloomfield's emphasis on the individual has sometimes overshadowed his view of language as social fact. Nevertheless, his general approach to language was directed away from its social setting enough to have prompted the American sociolinguist, William Labov, to place Bloomfield historically in an "asocial" group of linguists. This "asocial group" is represented by Paul, Sweet, Troubetzkoy, Hockett, Martinet, Kurylowicz, Chomsky and

Halle, who focus on the purely internal (structural or psychological) factors in explaining change. Labov contrasts this "asocial" group to a "social" group of linguists represented by Whitney, Schuchardt, Meillet, Vendryes, Jespersen and Sturtevant, who see on-going change reflected in dialect maps and emphasize the importance of linguistic diversity and languages in contact (1972:260-274).

- (6) However, see "Bloomfield as Dialectologist" by W. Moulton in HALL 1987:139-154.

- (7) Whitney does refer to language as 'a system of signs', as Koerner (1974) has pointed out, but it is not yet a system où tout se tient. Whitney is just as apt to refer to language as a "congeries of individual signs" (1867:32), that is a mere collection or mass of individual signs, as opposed to a true system of signs. Whitney writes, as well, that: "Language is made up of signs for thought, which, though in one sense parts of a whole, are in another and more essential sense isolated and independent entities" (1867:54).

- (8) The passage from Boas reads: "It would seem that the essential difference between linguistic phenomena and other ethnological phenomena is, that the linguistic classifications never rise into consciousness, while in

other ethnological phenomena, although the same unconscious origin prevails, these often rise into consciousness, and thus give rise to secondary reasoning and to re-interpretations" (1911:67).

Bloomfield paraphrases: "The classifications of language are, in fact, the clearest expressions of the associations made by the community as a whole. They are, accordingly, of great ethnologic significance. This significance is increased by the fact that they are far less subject to reflection than other communal activities (such as religion)" (1914:120).

Bibliography

- Andresen, Julie. 1985. Mainstream Linguistics and the 19th Century, paper presented at the National Meeting of the Modern Language Association. Chicago.
- _____. forthcoming. La formation de l'école américaine, in Histoire des idées linguistiques, ed. S. Auroux, vol. III, ch. 6, sec. 4:000-000. Liège: Mardaga.
- _____. forthcoming. Review of Paul Friedrich's The Language Parallax. Language in Society 00:000-000.
- _____. forthcoming. Linguistics in America 1769 - 1924: A Critical History. Croom Helm Publishers.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1983 [1914]. An Introduction to the Study of Language, ed. E.F.K. Koerner. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. Introduction to the Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part I. Bureau of American Ethnology. Bulletin 40. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1984. Review of An Introduction to the Study of Language, by L. Bloomfield. Historiographia Linguistica 10: 320-324.
- _____, ed. 1987. Leonard Bloomfield: Appraisals of his Life and Work. Special edition of Historiographia Linguistica XIV.1/2.
- Herbst, Jurgen. 1965. The German Historical School in American Scholarship. A Study in the Transfer of Culture. Cornell University Press.
- Hockett, Charles, ed. 1970. A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- _____. 1980. Preserving the Heritage, in First Person Singular, ed. B. David and R. O'Cain, 99-107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1971. The World Response to Whitney's Principle's of Linguistic Science. In SILVERSTEIN, xxv-xlv.
- _____. 1979. The Twentieth Century in European and American Linguistics: Movements and Continuity, in The European Background of American Linguistics, ed. H. Hoenigswald, 161-173. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Koerner, E.F.K. 1973. Ferdinand de Saussure. Origin and Development of his Linguistic Thought in Western Studies of Language: A contribution to the history and theory of linguistics. Braunschweig: F. Vieweg.
- . 1976. 1876 as a Turning Point in Linguistics. Journal of Indo-European Studies 4:4.333-53.
- . 1979. L'importance de William Dwight Whitney pour les jeunes linguistes de Leipzig et pour F. de Saussure, in Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday, ed. B. Brogyanyi, 438 - 454. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1983. Foreword to Leonard Bloomfield's Introduction to the Study of Language, ix - xvi. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Labov, William. 1972. Sociolinguistic Patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Moulton, William. 1967. Leonard Bloomfield as Germanist, in HOCKETT, 512-523.
- Müller-Vollmer, Kurt. 1974. Wilhelm von Humboldt und der Anfang der amerikanischen Sprachwissenschaft: Die Briefe an John Pickering, in Universalismus und Wissenschaft im Werk und Wirken der Brüder Humboldt, ed. Klaus Hammacher, 259-334. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Sapir, Edward. 1907. Herder's 'Über den Ursprung der Sprache'. Modern Philology 5.109-142. (reprinted in: Historiographia Linguistica XI:3.355-388, 1984).
- Silverstein, Michael, ed. 1971. Whitney on Language. MIT Press.
- Webster, Noah. 1951 [1789]. Dissertations on the English Language, introduction by Harry Warfel. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints.
- Whitney, William D. 1887 [1867]. Language and the Study of Language, 5th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's. (Die Sprachwissenschaft: W. D. Whitney's Vorlesungen über die Principien der vergleichenden Sprachforschung, translated by Julius Jolly, München: Th. Ackermann, 1874)
- . 1896 [1875]. The Life and Growth of Language. An Outline of Linguistic Science. New York: Appleton. (Leben und Wachstum der Sprache, translated by August Leskien, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876)